DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 245 CS 210 482

AUTHOR Culbertson, Hugh M.
TITLE Agenda Diversity: A Comparison of American and Filipino Editorials on the 1986 Filipino Election and Revolution.
PUB DATE 4 Aug 87
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987). Funding for part of this research provided by a grant from the United States Information Agency.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Developing Nations; *Editorials; Elections; *International Relations; Journalism; Media Research; *Newspapers; *Political Issues; Press Opinion; Revolution
IDENTIFIERS *Philippines; United States

ABSTRACT

Editorials in four prestigious American papers and two Filipino dailies addressing the 1986 election and revolution in the Philippines were compared for differences. Four hypotheses were tested: (1) that in treatment of the Philippines, editorials in the U.S. national prestige press would place more emphasis than do those in the Filipino newspapers on topics that have evolved over a long period, received intense recent coverage, and relate clearly to American interests and U.S.-Filipino relations; (2) that the Filipino press would focus editorials more often than does the U.S. press on concrete acts and events relating to the campaign, election, and revolution; (3) that editorials in either country would deal more often with acts involving primarily that country and its citizens; and (4) that Filipino editorials would have greater agenda diversity than would American newspapers about events in the Philippines. Thirty-eight editorials from the "Christian Science Monitor," "Wall Street Journal," "New York Times," and "Washington Post" were compared with 85 editorials from "Malaya" and the "Philippine Daily Inquirer," each of which dealt with the election and its context between January 15 and March 15, 1986. Each hypothesis was analyzed extensively, with the first three proving supportable and the fourth partially supportable. Overall, the similarities between American and Filipino editorials, when viewed in structural terms, tended to outweigh the differences. (Tables of data and 56 references are included.) (AEW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED281245

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AGENDA DIVERSITY: A COMPARISON OF AMERICAN AND FILIPINO EDITORIALS ON THE 1986 FILIPINO ELECTION AND REVOLUTION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hugh M. Culbertson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by Hugh M. Culbertson

Ohio University

Dr. Culbertson is a professor in the E. W. Scripps School of Journalism at Ohio University. Part of the research reported here was completed when he served as exchange professor in communication arts at De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines, in 1986 with a grant from the United States Information Service. He acknowledges the valuable insights of three colleagues: Dr. Anne Cooper, Dr. Juan Jamias and Prof. Gary Mariano. Paper presented to International Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, San Antonio, Texas, August 4, 1987.

CS210482

Advocates of a New World Information Order have charged that First-World press coverage of the Third World has over-emphasized coups, conflicts and natural disasters, as well as a few political, social and economic developments thought to involve fairly short-term rewards and threats to the West. Such coverage allegedly fails to address the complex web of factors which Westerners must understand to deal fruitfully with developing countries.[1]

If such charges are valid and reflect news executives' thinking, ethnocentrism and narrowness of focus ought to show up in western newspaper editorials about the third world. After all, western editors and publishers see it as quite appropriate to express personal priorities on their editorial pages.[2]

A narrow editorial-page agenda seems unfortunate in light of at least three strands of thought within the social sciences and western media studies:

1. Libertarian press theory, which holds that diversity of available information and arguments helps consumers find and identify that which is true and important.[3]

2. Social responsibility theory, which alleges that the press cannot discharge its responsibility simply by reporting bare facts. It must report them in a context which gives them meaning.[4] This role, in turn, seemingly requires a diverse agenda on the editorial page where, in American journalistic practice, much analyzing and interpreting are done.

3. A wide range of studies in philosophy, sociology, communication and other disciplines which suggest that breadth of perspective -- exposure to diverse points of view -- contributes to human achievement and productivity in general. Culbertson has reviewed pertinent literature.[5]

Any tendency to limit one's editorial focus to matters of obvious, direct concern to one's own nation may lead to clear differences between First-World and Third-world editorial treatment of developing countries. However, surprisingly few studies have compared western editorials about the third world with third-world domestic editorials.[6] This research sought to help fill that gap by focusing on editorials about the snap election and nearly bloodless revolution in February 1986 which unexpectedly ended the 20-year reign of Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos. Editorials in four prestigious American papers and two Filipino dailies were compared.

Studies of news coverage suggest that decision-making processes change as one moves from domestic to foreign content. Such factors as the expense of maintaining a foreign bureau,[7] censorship, and rules governing correspondent-diplomat relationships[8] apply with foreign but not domestic coverage. If news coverage builds a base for editorials, such differences might contribute to variation between domestic editorials about the revolution (here in the Filipino press) and foreign editorials (here in the American press).

A few scholars have dealt with national and regional differences in editorials. For instance, Nam found that Filipino newspapers ran more editorials harshly critical of the national government during the mid-1960s than did the Taiwanese and Korean press. The researcher attributed this difference partly to Filipino traditions of vitriolic press criticism and free expression.[9] Also, Lindley reported at about the same time that Iraqi newspapers tended to attribute social and political problems to imperialism just as western media did to communism.[10] And Sudhaker found more editorial-page coverage of the Bangladesh civil war by three Indian papers than by three prestigious U. S. dailies.[11]

For the most part, studies of editorials have focused on a few descriptive variables -- positive or negative leaning toward a political figure, party or program,[12] relative emphasis on broad news topic areas such as those defined by Deutschmann,[13] apparent intended function (advocacy, information or entertainment),[14] attention to specific issues or candidates,[15] geographic location,[16] language intensity,[17] semantic character(report, inference or judgment),[18] and presentation of stereotypes.[19]

While useful, these factors say little about thoroughness of attention to varied arguments and perspectives. However, thoroughness and variety surely relate to the oft-alleged narrowness and parochialism of Western news,[20] and the oft-quoted call under social responsibility theory for reporting the news in a context which gives it meaning.[21] The present research addresses these concerns by adapting for content analysis the notion of agenda diversity used in audience research by Chaffee and Wilson.[22]

These scholars defined agenda diversity as high where 1) people within a community mentioned many problems as important in the news,[23] and 2) those people disagreed often as to which topic was most important rather than naming one or a few problems almost to the exclusion of others.[24]

Chaffee and Wilson reported evidence that communities with many media outlets had relatively high agenda diversity. However, the authors did not measure topic diversity within a given news outlet. Noting that only a few studies[25] had looked at content diversity from an information-processing standpoint, they urged such a research focus.[26]

In one related study of New York Times and Washington Post editorials, Minor found heavy emphasis on just seven of 13 topic categories related to the Vietnam War. Fairly low breadth of coverage was inferred.[27]

Predictions here stem largely from the oft-cited assertion by Galtung and Ruge that the media cover primarily topics which seem relevant and meaningful within the audience's socio-cultural context. These authors focused on news.[28] This study extends their arguments to content of two nations' editorials.

Comparison of recent U. S. and Filipino papers seems apt to be revealing. Americans sometimes refer to the Philippines as their only colony. And even today, after 40 years of independence, Filipinos often both look back fondly at the American presence and resent continuing cultural, economic and political influence in the country by their former "masters." Further, the two countries retain close economic and military ties. Yet their closeness has often been made uncomfortable by vastly different social and cultural orientations.[29]

It's worth noting here that studies on the impact of editorials have conflicted. In recent research on American presidential campaigns, Robinson has noted what he defined as significant impact by editorial endorsements even after numerous controls were introduced.[30] However, Hurd and Singletary discerned little if any impact of presidential endorsements.[31] On the other hand, studies by Gregg,[32] McCombs,[33] and McLenghan[34] have suggested that endorsements often affect voting on local and issue-referendum campaigns where news coverage is apt to be spotty, party labels are largely irrelevant, and voters have few cues to go on. Such findings suggest that editorials may have greatest impact when they show breadth of perspective as defined here (that is, where they deal with varied topics of local relevance and do not simply focus on a few matters presumed salient in the national or international arena, and therefore covered heavily in news columns).

Hypotheses

Four hypotheses are tested. The fourth deals directly with agenda diversity or breadth of perspective within editorials. The first three hypotheses relate to factors wich probably contribute to diversity.

Specifically, hypotheses 1 and 2 focus on the extent to which editorials dwell on a few global, widely publicized issues as opposed to arguments, developments and issues within the nation covered. The third hypothesis concerns another element which may detract from diversity -- the probable tendency of any nation's press to deal more extensively with behavior of its own citizens than with residents of another country.

Hypothesis 1. In treatment of the Philippines, editorials in the U. S. national prestige press should place more emphasis than do those in the Filipino newspapers on a few global topics which meet one or more of three conditions. First, these topics have evolved over a long period. Second, they had received intense recent press coverage at the time when editorials appeared. And third, they relate clearly to American interests and U. S.-Filipino relations.

As will be noted later, nine such topics showed up among 22 covered within editorials and related news. Topics meeting some of the three criteria should be fairly familiar even to Americans with only superficial knowledge of and concern about the Philippines. This, in turn, should contribute to editorial emphasis on them in light of two arguments. First, Galtung and Ruge assert that the news media deal most fully with that which they believe is meaningful and relevant to news consumers.[35] And second, American journalists appear to assume their audiences have little interest in international news except where intense or long-term coverage and/or obvious relvance to U. S. interests place it high on the news agenda.[36]

Studies of news coverage have supported the second of these arguments. Ahern[37] and Rosengren[38] have reported that strength and range of economic and political ties between two countries correlate rather strongly with amount of news coverage of one country by the other's media. If such ties figure in editorial thinking, they should come up rather frequently in one country's editorials about another as hypothesized here.

Hypothesis 2. The Filipino press should focus editorials more often than does the American press on many concrete acts and events relating to the campaign, election, revolution and surrounding context.

It's assumed here that most events relating to the Filipino political drama occurred in that country, not in the United States. Furthermore, invoking the Galtung-Ruge[39] notion of relevance, these events should have clearer meaning to Filipinos than to Americans. And Filipino editorial writers should thus feel more confident about "sharing meaning" with their readers about these events than would American writers.

In related studies of news coverage, Shaw and Stephenson,[40] as well as Weaver and Wilhoit,[41] found high percentages of news sources were national-level executive-branch officials in international wire stories packaged for the western media. Such officials presumably often make decisions about and represent a nation as a whole in ways seen as relevant to foreign countries. In contrast, many possible news sources representing specific sectors (i. e., schools, churches, industries, etc.) and affecting events within the nations reported on received little attention. Sociologists such as Fishman[42] suggest that emphasis on a few governmental sources stems in part from beat structures which aid efficiency by routinizing and legitimizing reliance on a small number of sources seen as important, reliable and accessible.

Hypothesis 3. Looking at treatment of concrete recent events, editorials in either country should deal more often with acts involving primarily that country and its citizens than with acts involving the other country.

The rationale here is basically the same as that for hypothesis 2. American readers might have little awareness of, say, ex-Gov. Evelio Javier of Antique Province, an Aquino supporter who was murdered during the campaign. Likewise, many Filipino readers would hardly know what to make of Sen. James Sasser, D-Tenn., an early advocate of withdrawing U. S. support from Marcos. Thus each of these men might gain more attention with actions in his own nation's editorials than in the other nation's.

One study provides some support for this prediction. Sudhaker discovered greater attention to specifics of the Bangladesh civil war in news and editorial coverage by three Indian papers than by the New York Times, Washington Post and Los Angeles Times.[43] Of course, India had maintained a close association with Bangladesh while the United States had not. In India, the war was a "local" story.

Hypothesis 4. Overall, Filipino editorials should have greater agenda diversity, as reflected in H statistics, than would American editorials about events in the Philippines.

As noted earlier, an editorial agenda is diverse where a large number of topics are treated -- and where concentration is not centered on one or a few topics. Hypothesis 4 really follows from the first three hypotheses if one assumes that, as suggested by the data collected here:

1. There are relatively few broad, global problems, charges and other topics presented in connection with the election scenario.

2. There are a large number of concrete acts and events which might be noted and evaluated within such a complex phenomenon as a national election.

3. The Filipino press is more apt than the American press, because of perceived relevance and consequence to the audience, to focus on concrete acts and events and their apparent meanings.

Hypothesis 4 and research question 1 involve the H-statistic discussed by Chaffee and Wilson,[44] Keele,[45] and Lin.[46] As applied to cognitive activity, H is defined by the following formula:

$$H=\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \ (\log_2 1/p_i)$$

In this notation, p_i = the proportion of all cases falling within the ith category.

n=the number of categories in use.

$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$ =the act of summing for all categories from 1 through n.

$\log_2$ =logarithm or exponent to the base 2.

In this content analysis, each topic covered is defined as a category. And p_i is the percentage of all of a newspaper's paragraphs mentioning any inventoried topic which deal with the ith topic.

Chaffee and Wilson explain that H depends on two logically independent factors: the number of categories used, and the extent to which observations are spread equally over all categories rather than being clustered in one or a few.[47]

Applying this to the present research, H for a given newspaper depends on 1) the number of topics treated in the paper's editorials, and 2) the variation among percentages of paragraphs relating to all inventoried topics which were devoted to each of these topics. We gauge the latter by treating each percentage for a given newspaper as an observation and computing a standard deviation of all percentages for that paper.

Surely, in light of social responsibility theory as noted earlier, diagnosis of editorial performance by a given paper might usefully focus in part on the number of topics treated and the variation in emphasis from topic to topic. This sets the stage for the first research question:

Research question 1. What correlation, if any, exists between the number of topics treated editorially and variation in emphasis on any one topic?

In theory, the two components might go hand-in-hand -- breadth of coverage might stem from forces that also minimize concentration on any one or a few topics. However, some editors may mention many topics in passing but concentrate on one or a few. Further, overall number of editorials on Filipino politics surely influences number of topics presented but not variation in emphasis among topics. This difference could weaken any association between number of topics treated and variation among percentage "weights" devoted to specific topics.

Methodology

Choice of newspapers. American dailies chosen were four often regarded as the country's elite national papers -- the Christian Science Monitor, Wall Street Journal, New York Times and Washington Post.[48] These papers were selected partly because they seemed appropriate for an analysis, reported elsewhere,[49] of the extent to which the American media had a genuine vendetta against Marcos as he and his followers alleged.[50] It was felt that such elite papers, more than others, might have influenced the Reagan administration to "dump" the Filipino president.

Choice of Filipino papers was difficult. The most well-established dailies in the country as of January 1, 1986, appeared to include the Bulletin Today (later named the Manila Bulletin) and the Manila Daily Express, both controlled by Marcos followers. Interestingly, perusal of editorials in these papers during the campaign revealed very little mention of substantive election issues or officials' actions and candidate stands. The Bulletin and Express dealt almost entirely with the "horse race" -- who was winning and how -- and on the electoral process itself. Basically, it appeared, this election focused on bad features of the Marcos regime rather than good things about Marcos or anything good or bad about his opponent, Corazon C. Aquino. And obviously the "crony press" was not inclined to deal with anti-Marcos arguments!

In light of all this, data were collected on two "mosquito" papers, Malaya and the Philippine Daily Inquirer, which gained considerable fame and circulation during the campaign. The Inquirer, a weekly with 15,000 circulation prior to the campaign, became a daily with 300,000 copies sold by March. Malaya also grew rapidly. Many observers believed that, during the election aftermath, Filipinos relied heavily on these papers along with the church-owned Radio Veritas and other radio stations.[51]

Time period. All 123 editorials in the six papers dealing with the Filipino election and its context between January 15 and March 15 were coded. It seemed important to focus on the same period within each set of papers so the pool of recent events which might have been addressed was identical from paper to paper. The campaign began picking up steam around January 15. Apparently few editorials in the American papers were missed by choosing that starting date -- in fact, only one appeared in any of the four papers prior to January 27.

The election was held on February 7. Protests and procedural disputes about the vote count dominated Filipino news until Army Chief of Staff Gen. Fidel V. Ramos and Defense Minister Juan Ponce Enrile defected from the Marcos camp on February 22. Marcos finally left for Hawaii on February 25. Aquino's consolidation of power, release of political prisoners and reluctant declaration that her government was revolutionary gained some attention in the American press for about two and one-half weeks after that date. March 15 was chosen as the concluding date after the researcher noted that the four U. S. papers ran only three editorials about the Philippines during the preceding week. Interest obviously had waned by then.

The American papers ran 38 editorials in all -- 10 in the New York Times, 8 in the Wall Street Journal, 11 in the Washington Post, and 9 in the Christian Science Monitor. The Filipino papers carried a total of 85 -- 44 in the Philippine Inquirer and 41 in Malaya.

Topics inventoried. In all, 22 topics treated quite extensively in news coverage dealt with problems, misdeeds and proposed courses of action relating to the election and revolution. Most topics had to do with developments during the Marcos years. Only three issues dealt solely with actions taken by or urged upon Aquino. These were appointment of cabinet members after February 25, declaration of a revolutionary government so as to void the Marcos constitution and dissolve the legislature dominated by his followers, and replacement of local and provincial officials with appointed interim "officers-in-charge."

Nine issues met the criteria specified under hypothesis 1 for "global, long-range" topics. These factors were American press focus on a topic over a long period, intense recent coverage, and clear relevance to U. S.-Filipino relations. In particular:

1. Growth of the communist insurgency and its military arm, the New People's Army, had taken place over at least 17 years.

2. Human rights violations (killings, imprisonment without trial and various kinds of harassment) allegedly occurred at least from Marcos's declaration of martial law in 1972 until the election.

3. The huge U. S. military bases in the Philippines had been salient since the early 1970s when the nation's other key Southeast Asian installation, Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam, was lost to the Vietnamese. Also, the bases obviously were central to U. S.-Filipino relations.

4. U. S.-Filipino relations were also a long-standing concern dating back at least to the granting of independence to the Philippines in 1946.

5. Five other issues received intense coverage in the U. S. in late 1985 and early 1986. These were fear of election rigging, alleged skimming of U. S. aid by Marcos, the first family's excessive wealth and opulent lifestyle, corrupt acts favoring Marcos "cronies," and the apparent shipping of money and goods abroad.

All nine of these matters should have been "forced" onto the American editorial agenda by length and/or intensity of media coverage and clear relevance to U. S. interests. In contrast, the other 13 issues dealt with relatively specific "micro" level acts, problems and issues within the Philippines. Table 1 lists these topics.

Operational definition of dependent variables. Hypothesis 1 was tested separately with two dependent measures to strive for some convergent validity:

1. Percentage of editorials in a given paper or nation which discussed a particular topic. Length or amount of discussion within an editorial was not tapped by this measure.

2. Percentage of "topic paragraph mentions" for a given paper or nation's press which were devoted to a given topic. Such a mention occurred whenever an editorial alluded in some way to a topic within a single paragraph. Percentages here expressed relative emphasis so as to control for total amount of coverage given to all topics when comparing papers or paper sets.

With the second of these variables, the paragraph was the unit of analysis. This could be questioned in that paragraphs certainly differed in length. However, examination suggested paragraphs differed relatively little within a given paper. Furthermore, most analyses focused on percentages of paragraphs within a given paper or national set of papers. Thus variation in paragraph length between papers or nations was effectively removed from play.

Statistics used in testing hypothesis 4 and answering research question 1 were obtained from a table of values in Keele's Attention and Human Performance.[52] Percentages were rounded off to the nearest one-half percent. Where fractional values resulted, linear interpolation was used to obtain approximate values of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(\log_2 1/p_i)$. These figures were summed across topics to obtain an H-statistic for a given paper.

Findings

Table 1 supports the first hypothesis. A higher percentage of American than Filipino editorials addressed each of the nine global issues. Based on a sign test, the probability of such a consistent relationship occurring by chance is .002.

Put table 1 about here.

Turning to percentages of "topical paragraph mentions," American percentages exceeded those for Filipino editorials with seven of nine topics. This difference approached significance($p=.09$). The topics which departed from the general pattern were favoring of cronies and fixing of the election by Marcos -- obviously overriding concerns in Manila.

Clearly, then, the American papers focused more heavily than did their Filipino counterparts on global topics which even the distant or casual observer might have meaning for. On the other hand, based on topical paragraph mentions, the Filipino press emphasized such concrete, localized topics as payoffs to potential voters, specific acts of corruption, opulence at Malanang Palace, the anti-Marcos military-reform movement, an alleged cover-up of the president's poor health, and President Aquino's eventual declaration that her government was revolutionary.

In table 2, hypothesis 1 holds quite uniformly from paper to paper. Each American paper mentioned seven of the nine global topics in a higher percentage of its editorials than did each Filipino paper ($p < .001$).[53] The only exceptions had to do with Marcos cronies (whom the New York Times and Christian Science Monitor largely ignored) and alleged skimming of foreign aid (which the Wall Street Journal and Washington Post ignored completely).

Percentages of paragraph mentions, in parentheses in table 2, reveal a similar pattern, though with some additional exceptions. Overall, American editorials focused on global issues familiar to the casual, distant observer while Filipino papers gave somewhat more (though not overwhelming) emphasis to day-to-day details of the electoral process and Filipino society.

Put table 2 about here.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 pursue further the idea that Filipino papers, in their pursuit of day-to-day details, react often to concrete actions and events. Both hypotheses were supported.

Turning first to hypothesis 2, 63% of editorials in Malaya and the Philippine Inquirer dealt primarily with specific recent actions and events. This compared with just 32% for the four American papers. The difference was highly significant. (X^2_y=23.10, 1 df, p <.001)

Hypothesis 3 deals only with editorials keyed to specific events and actions. Ten (83%) of the 12 event-oriented U. S. editorials dealt with events and actions within the United States and/or involving U. S. actors. Turning to Filipino editorials, only 16% dealt primarily with American events and actors. Once again, the difference was as predicted and highly significant. (X^2_y=20.53, 1 df, p <.001)

It is of interest to note events that American editors focused upon. Two editorials dealt primarily with Marcos's arrival in Hawaii, two with discovery of Marcos's wealth and related documents after the party's arrival, two with the New York Times revelation of January 23 that the U. S. Army had regarded Marcos's claims of heroism during World War II as fraudulant, and four with President Ronald Reagan's speech of February 10. That speech praised apparent progress toward a real two-party system in the islands, asserted that fraud apparently had occurred on both sides, and called at least implicitly for support of Marcos as the declared winner.

One Filipino act which triggered favorable editorial treatment in the Wall Street Journal was a speech by Aquino's finance minister, Jaime Ongpin, calling the private sector a key to his nation's economic recovery. The other Filipino move which led at least one American editorial writer to comment was Marcos's announcement on February 4 that his controversial military leader, Gen. Fabian Ver, would oversee the election. Ver's resignation had been demanded by many people in the wake of charges that he'd masterminded the 1983 assassination of Ex-Sen. Benigno Aquino.

Hypothesis 4 held that the Filipino papers would have higher agenda diversity, as gauged by the H-statistic, than do American editorials. Table 3 provides only partial support here. The Philippine Inquirer did have the highest H value of all six papers. However, Malaya ranked fifth among the six papers, trailing all but the Christian Science Monitor. The Monitor registered just 2.69 "bits," while the other five papers fell in the range of 3.23 to 3.60.

Put table 3 about here.

Looking at the two factors which presumably contribute to H, the data show that:

1. Malaya and the Monitor had narrowness in both senses. They covered few topics (14 in each case of the total of 22) and concentrated to a fairly high degree on a few issues as shown by high standard deviations. Turning to table 2, the Monitor focused heavily on three global topics: U. S.-Filipino relations, the bases issue and the communist insurgency. Malaya, on the other hand, concentrated more heavily than any other paper on three specific local topics: officers-in-charge, first-family opulence and President Aquino's reluctance to declare her new government revolutionary.

2. Washington Post editorials covered few issues (just 12) but trailed only the Wall Street Journal in giving nearly equal attention to all issues as shown by relatively low standard deviations. In fact, table 2 shows that the Post devoted more than 12.5% of its topical paragraphs to only one issue, election rigging.

3. The New York Times and Philippine Inquirer covered a lot of issues (18 in each case). However, these papers failed to "run away from the pack" with very high H-statistics because they had moderately high standard deviations. Both papers concentrated heavily on election rigging.

Research question 1 deals with a possible correlation across newspapers between number of topics covered and variation among topic-paragraph percentages. The Spearman rank correlation between these two variables was only a non-significant -.06. Within this data set, then, number of topics and variation in treatment accorded them appeared to be quite separate.

As an aside, H correlated as assumed with the two contributing factors. Spearman coefficients were positive (at .80) with number of topics covered, but negative (at -.49) with standard deviations for the six papers. Neither correlation was significant (with just six newspapers, r_s would need to reach at least .82 to differ significantly from 0 at p=.05). However, these moderate to high correlations suggest that both number of topics and equality of emphasis deserve attention in studying breadth of editorial coverage, each affecting H.

Summary and Conclusions

This study focused on editorials dealing with the February 1986 Filipino snap election and revolution which ended the reign of President Ferdinand Marcos. All 123 related editorials in six newspapers during a two-month period were coded. Included were the four American national elite papers, the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post and Christian Science Monitor, along with two influential independent papers in the Philippines, Malaya and the Philippine Daily Inquirer.

As expected, the American editorials concentrated heavily on global, broad topics which should have been familiar even to casual, distant observers of the Philippines. These issues met one or more of three criteria -- long-term evolution, intense recent news coverage, and direct relevance to presumed American interests.

Also as expected, the Filipino papers dealt more heavily, though not predominantly, with day-to-day events and micro-level issues within the Philippines.

Both sets of findings squared with the assertion by Galtung and Ruge that news media deal primarily with topics seen as meaningful and relevant within news consumers' socio-cultural contexts.[54]

The H-statistic gauged agenda diversity of editorials in each paper. Filipino papers were expected to offer relatively rich editorial agendas because of their focus on numerous local events and related topics. This expectation was borne out with respect to the Inquirer, but not with Malaya.

The study examined two facets of agenda diversity -- number of topics addressed and the extent to which a paper gave nearly equal emphasis (gauged by percentage of paragraphs) to the topics covered. As expected, number of topics correlated positively, and standard deviations of percentages negatively, with H-statistics for individual papers. Furthermore, the lack of any real correlation between these two factors (number of topics and standard deviation) suggests they deserve separate attention in analyzing news-agenda diversity.

One caveat seems in order. Equal coverage of all issues is doubtless an unreasonable, even undesirable, goal -- some topics in any campaign doubtless seem more important than others. Perhaps future research could compare actual press emphasis with that which seems optimum to carefully chosen experts. However, the choice of experts is bound to be arbitrary. In any case, concentration of most attention on just one or a few issues seems apt to be questionable. Surely the optimum standard deviation among topic percentages normally would lie somewhere between the two extremes.

In future research, the "global vs. specific" distinction among topics needs refinement. The underlying notion here was that a global issue would be of interest even to casual, relatively uninformed, distant observers because of intense and/or lengthy press coverage -- and/or because of clear relevance to the observers' own nations and lives. This definition may or may not correlate highly with the notions of abstractness and broad scope in space and time sometimes associated with the word global.

Looking at American press performance, there were some apparent negatives. U. S. editorials focused quite heavily on a few global, obvious issues while making few attempts to acquaint readers with concrete events or personalities in the Philippines. Of the four U. S. papers, only the New York Times gave editorial-page attention to more than two-thirds of the topics inventoried.

Readers who relied solely on editorials might have gained little or no inkling of Marcos payoffs, arrests of journalists, the naming of controversial municipal and provincial offers-in-charge, and many other important topics which became salient before and after the election.

However, the American press held its own as to agenda diversity overall when compared with two aggressive Filipino papers which grappled daily with the election and its context. Supporters of the western media might also make these points:

1. As a world power, the U. S. must attend to a number of troublesome issues at any one time. It could hardly be expected to devote more editorials than it did -- about one per week in each paper -- to a relatively small, distant country such as the Philippines. And of course, number of editorials helped determine agenda diversity.

2. Nitty gritty details of an event should be a focus of news coverage rather than editorials. The two go hand in hand. A study of American news coverage of the election campaign is underway.

3. Malaya and the Philippine Daily Inquirer provide an imperfect benchmark for gauging U. S. media performance. These papers had obvious liberal and Filipino-nationalist leanings which may have led them to downplay the communist insurgency as a fairly minor problem, ignore U. S.-related issues and emphasize symbolic questions such as Marcos-family wealth and political payoffs.

Analyses reported elsewhere suggested that the prestige press led more than it followed in calling for U. S. abandonment of the Marcos regime. Moreover, careful reading of the 38 American editorials did not suggest great ethnocentrism. Editors often called for substantial reforms in the Philippines even though they advocated Marcos's departure only at the eleventh hour. And the four papers repeatedly urged Reagan not to retain Clark Air Base and Subic Bay Naval Base at all costs and without regard to the rights and interests of the Filipino people.[55]

Overall, the similarities observed here between American and Filipino editorials, when viewed in structural terms, tended to outweigh the differences. Agenda diversity did not differ substantially between the two nations. Also, each nation's editorials stressed events in its homeland more than those abroad. These results square with Edelstein's conclusion that comparative research shows many similarities in press performance from society to society -- especially when relational factors of conflict, trade and linguistic commonality are considered.[56]

Certainly the results here indicate that agenda diversity can shed light on press performance and deserves further emphasis.

TABLE 1

Percentages of Editorials and of Topic Paragraph Mentions Which Dealt with 22 Topics Relating to the 1986 Filipino Election and Revolution

Topic	Percentage of editorials mentioning topic		Percentage of topic paragraph mentions dealing with topic	
	U. S. papers (n=38)	Filipino papers (n=85)	U. S. papers (n=308)	Filipino papers (n=473)
Global Topics				
Granting favors to Marcos cronies	21.1	11.8	3.6	6.1
Election rigging (intimidation, abuse of count, etc.)	60.5	42.3	22.7	29.4
Movement of Marcos wealth abroad to prevent reclaiming by nation	23.7	7.1	6.5	2.1
Stealing foreign aid, use for personal gain	10.5	1.2	1.6	0.2
U. S.-Filipino relations	47.4	7.1	14.9	3.6
U. S. military bases in country	31.6	4.7	5.8	2.1
Poverty, decline of economy	36.8	10.6	6.5	5.3
Communist insurgency, New People's Army	52.6	3.5	10.4	0.6
Human rights violations, including silencing of press	50.0	21.2	9.4	6.3
Specific, local topics				
Denial of media access to opposition by Marcos	10.5	2.4	1.3	2.5
Payoffs and favors by Marcos people	18.4	14.1	2.6	11.2

Table 1(cont.)

	Percentage of editorials mentioning topic		Percentage of topic paragraph mentions dealing with topic	
	U. S. papers	Filipino papers	U. S. papers[a]	Filipino papers[b]
Abuses and activity of warlords, Civilian Home Defense Force	2.6	2.4	0.3	1.3
Miscellaneous corruption of Marcos regime	13.2	11.8	2.3	4.7
Marcos wealth, opulence	10.5	15.3	1.9	7.0
Corruption, ineffectiveness of armed forces	28.9	12.9	4.2	5.5
Soviet-Filipino relations	10.5	1.2	1.3	0.2
Fraud in Marcos war record	13.2	---	3.2	---
Marcos's health, cover-up	7.9	2.4	1.0	2.8
Marcos control over media	---	2.4	---	0.8
Aquino cabinet appointments	---	---	---	---
Declaration of revolutionary government	2.6	4.7	0.3	7.0
Aquino choices of officers-in-charge (local, provincial)	--	2.4	---	1.3

[a] Percentages sum to 99.8 because of rounding error.

[b] Percentages sum to 100

TABLE 2

Percentages of Editorials and Topic Paragraph Mentions in Each Paper Which Dealt with Each of 22 Topics[a]

Topic	Philippine Inquirer	Malaya	New York Times	Wall Street Journal	Washington Post	Christian Science Monitor
Global Topics						
Granting favors to Marcos cronies	11.4 (6.5)	9.8 (6.0)	10.0 (1.0)	37.5 (9.0)	18.2 (5.0)	11.1 (1.5)
Election rigging (intimidation, abuse of count, etc.)	40.9 (30.5)	43.9 (29.0)	70.0 (28.5)	50.0 (14.5)	45.4 (20.5)	77.8 (26.5)
Movement of Marcos wealth abroad to prevent reclaiming by nation	4.5 (3.0)	9.8 (2.0)	30.0 (8.0)	12.5 (1.5)	18.2 (11.0)	22.2 (2.5)
Stealing foreign aid, use for personal gain	2.3 (0.5)	--- ---	20.0 (3.5)	--- ---	--- ---	22.2 (2.5)
U. S.-Filipino relations	11.4 (8.0)	2.4 (0.5)	40.0 (6.5)	37.5 (13.0)	45.4 (11.0)	66.7 (30.5)
U. S. military bases in country	6.8 (3.5)	2.4 (1.0)	30.0 (5.5)	12.5 (1.5)	27.3 (6.5)	55.6 (10.0)
Poverty, decline of economy	9.1 (3.5)	12.2 (6.0)	30.0 (5.5)	62.5 (13.0)	36.4 (6.5)	22.2 (2.5)
Communist insurgency, New People's Army	6.8 (1.5)	--- ---	60.0 (11.0)	62.5 (13.0)	36.4 (9.5)	55.6 (9.0)
Human rights violations, including silencing of press	27.3 (8.5)	14.6 (5.0)	50.0 (9.0)	75.0 (12.0)	45.4 (12.5)	33.3 (6.5)
Specific, local topics						
Denial of media access to opposition by Marcos	4.5 (6.0)	--- ---	20.0 (2.0)	12.5 (1.5)	--- ---	11.1 (1.5)
Payoffs and favors by Marcos people	9.1 (9.0)	19.5 (13.0)	30.0 (3.5)	25.0 (4.5)	9.1 (1.5)	11.1 (1.5)

Topic	Philippine Inquirer	Malaya	New York Times	Wall Street Journal	Washington Post	Christian Science Monitor
Abuses and activity of warlords, Civilian Home Defense Force	4.5 (3.0)	--- ---	10.0 (1.0)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---
Miscellaneous corruption of Marcos regime	9.1 (5.0)	12.2 (5.0)	30.0 (3.5)	--- ---	18.2 (6.5)	--- ---
Marcos wealth, opulence	11.4 (3.0)	19.5 (10.0)	10.0 (1.0)	--- ---	18.2 (5.0)	11.1 (2.5)
Corruption, ineffectiveness of armed forces	15.9 (6.5)	9.8 (5.0)	40.0 (4.5)	25.0 (6.0)	27.3 (5.0)	22.2 (2.5)
Soviet-Filipino relations	2.3 (0.5)	--- ---	20.0 (2.0)	25.0 (3.0)	--- ---	--- ---
Fraud in Marcos war record	--- ---	--- ---	10.0 (3.5)	25.0 (3.0)	--- ---	11.1 (1.5)
Marcos's health, cover-up	--- ---	4.9 (5.0)	10.0 (1.0)	25.0 (3.0)	--- ---	--- ---
Marcos control over media	4.5 (2.0)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---
Aquino cabinet appointments	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---
Declaration of revolutionary government	--- ---	9.8 (12.4)	--- ---	12.5 (1.5)	--- ---	--- ---
Aquino choices of officers-in-charge (local, provincial)	2.3 (1.0)	2.4 (1.0)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---
No. of topic paragraph mentions	197	266	91	68	63	79

[a]In each cell, the number in parentheses is the percentage of a paper's topic paragraph mentions focusing on the topic denoted in the corresponding row. The number outside parentheses is the percentage of a paper's editorials dealing with that topic.

The numbers of editorials were 44 for the Philippine Inquirer, 41 in Malaya, 8 in the Wall Street Journal, 10 in the New York Times, 11 in the Washington Post, and 9 in the Christian Science Monitor. Percentages for number of topic paragraph mentions summed to 100 except for rounding error within a given newspaper. However, since many editorials mentioned more than one topic, percentages of editorials for any given paper exceed 100.

TABLE 3

H-statistics, Standard Deviations for Paragraph Mentions and Numbers of Topics Covered by Six Newspapers

Newspaper	H-statistic	Standard Deviation	Number of Topics
Philipine Daily Inquirer	3.60	6.35	18
New York Times	3.55	6.04	18
Wall Street Journal	3.49	5.13	15
Washington Post	3.37	5.45	12
Malaya	3.23	6.65	14
Christian Science Monitor	2.69	8.01	14

Footnotes

[1]Mustapha Masmoudi, "A Call to Broaden the News," Action, August 14, 14, 1978, p. 6; Mort Rosenblum, Coups and Earthquakes (New York: Harper and Row, 1979); Alfred Smith, The Geopolitics of Information (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 68-110.

[2]Verne E. Edwards, Jr., Journalism in a Free Society (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 157-72

[3]Fred S. Siebert, Theodore Peterson and Wilbur Schramm, Four Theories of the Press (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956), pp. 40-62.

[4]Ibid., p. 88.

[5]Hugh M. Culbertson, "Breadth of Perspective: An Important Concept in Public Relations," Public Relations Research and Education (in press).

[6]For one example, see Anantha B. Sudhaker, "The Bangla Desh War in Print: An Analysis of Three American and Three Indian English Language Newspapers' Coverage and Editorial Attention," unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1976 .

[7]John Wilhelm, "The Re-Appearing Foreign Correspondents: a World Survey," Journalism Quarterly, 40:147-68 (Spring 1963).

[8]W. Phillips Davison, "Diplomatic Reporting: Rules of the Game," Journal of Communication, 25:138-46 (Autumn 1975).

[9]Sunwoo Nam, "Editorials as an Indicator of Press Freedom in Three Asian Countries," Journalism Quarterly, 48:730-40 (Winter 1971).

[10]William R. Lindley, "Anti-Imperialism as a Theme in the Press of Iraq," Journalism Quarterly, 44:540-2 (Autumn 1967).

[11]Sudhaker, op. cit.

[12]David Daugherty and Michael Warden, "Prestige Press Editorial Treatment of the Mideast During 11 Crisis Years," Journalism Quarterly, 56:776-82 (Winter 1979); Jae-Won Lee,"Editorial Support and Campaign News: Content Analysis by Q-Method," Journalism Quarterly, 49:710-6 (Winter 1972); Nam, op. cit.

[13]Paul Deutschmann, "News-Page Content of Twelve Metropolitan Dailies," unpublished report of a study sponsored by Scripps-Howard Research, October 1959, pp. 58-62; David S. Meyers, "Editorials and Foreign Affairs in the 1964 Presidential Campaign," Journalism Quarterly, 45:211-8 (Summer 1968); Meyers, "Editorials and Foreign Affairs in the 1968 Presidential Campaign," Journalism Quarterly, 47:57-64 (Spring 1970); Meyers, "Editorials on the Economy in the 1980 Presidential Campaign," Journalism Quarterly, 59:414-9 (Autumn 1982); Meyers, "Editorials and Foreign Affairs in Recent Presidential Campaigns," Journalism Quarterly, 59:541-7 (Winter 1982).

[14]John W. Windhauser, "Content Patterns of Editorials in Ohio Metropolitan Dailies," Journalism Quarterly, 50:562-7 (Autumn 1973).

[15]Keith Sinclair, "British Prestige Press Editorials on Leadership During 1979 Campaign," Journalism Quarterly, 59:230-4, 294 (Summer 1982).

[16]Windhauser, op. cit.

[17]Lucinda Lee Stephenson, "Scapegoats, Slackers and Spies: The Portrayal of Germany, Germans and German-Americans by Three Eastern Iowa Newspapers During World War I," unpublished M. S. thesis, Iowa State University, 1985.

[18]Anie San Nhana, "A Content Analysis of the Coverage of the Camp David Peace Initiative," unpublished M. S. thesis, West Virginia University, 1981.

[19]Thomas M. Carney, "The American Image in a Peruvian Daily: Effects of Changes in Government and Government Control," unpublished M. S. thesis, Iowa State University, 1977.

[20]George Gerbner and George Marvanyi, "The Many Worlds of the World's Press," Journalism Quarterly, 27:52-66 (Winter 1977); Jim A. Hart, "Foreign News in U. S. and English Daily Newspapers," Journalism Quarterly, 43:443-8 (Fall 1966).

[21]Siebert, Peterson and Schramm, op. cit., p. 87.

[22]Steven H. Chaffee and Donna G. Wilson, "Media Rich, Media Poor: Two Studies of Diversity in Agenda-Holding," Journalism Quarterly, 54:466-76 (Autumn 1977).

[23]The measurement strategy here was to report the number of responses per person within a geographic area to questions about problems or topics in the news.

[24]H values were based on the percentage distribution of respondents within any given county who named various problems in the news as being important or most important.

[25]James H. Watt and Robert Krull, "An Information Theory Measure for Television Programming," Communication Research, 1:44-68 (January 1974).

[26]Chaffee and Wilson, op. cit.

[27]Augusta D. Minor, "Attitudes of the New York Times and Washington Post Toward the Vietnam War as Expressed in Their Editorials (1968): A Content Analysis," unpublished M. S. thesis, Iowa State University, 1981.

[28]Johann Galtung and Mari Ruge, "Structuring and Selectiong News," in Stanley Cohen and Jock Young, eds., The Manufacture of News (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1973), pp. 62-72.

[29]Bonifacio S. Salamanca, The Filipino Reaction to American Rule, 1901-1913 (Quezon City, Philippines: New Day Publishers, 1984), pp. 44-132.

[30]John S. Robinson, "The Press as King Maker: What Surveys from Last Five Campaigns Show," Journalism Quarterly, 51:587-94 (Winter 1974).

[31]Robert E. Hurd and Michael W. Singletary, "Newspaper Endorsement Influence on the 1980 Presidential Election Vote," Journalism Quarterly, 61:332-8 (Summer 1984).

[32]James E. Gregg, "Newspaper Editorial Endorsements and California Elections, 1948-62," Journalism Quarterly, 42:532-8 (Summer 1965).

[33]Maxwell McCombs, "Editorial Endorsements: A Study of Influence," Journalism Quarterly, 44:545-54 (Autumn 1967).

[34]Jack Sean McClenghan, "Effect of Endorsements in Texas Local Elections," Journalism Quarterly, 50:363-6 (Summer 1973).

[35]Galtung and Ruge, loc. cit.

[36]Hugh M. Culbertson, "Three Perspectives on American Journalism," Journalism Monographs, No. 83, June 1983, p. 25.

[37]Thomas J. Ahern, Jr., "Determinants of Foreign News Coverage in U. S. Newspapers," paper presented to International Communication Association, Boston, Mass., 1982.

[38] Karl Erik Rosengren, "International News: Methods, Data and Theory," Journal of Peace Research, 11:145-56 (1974).

[39] Galtung and Ruge, loc. cit.

[40] Donald L. Shaw and Robert L. Stephenson, "World of Conflict -- World of Peace: Foreign Affairs News in Newspapers from Stable vs. Pluralistic Political Systems," paper presnted to International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Athens, Ohio, 1982.

[41] G. Cleveland Wilhoit and David Weaver, "Foreign News Coverage in Two U. S. Wire Services: an Update," Journal of Communication, 33:132-48 (Spring 1983).

[42] Mark Fishman, Manufacturing the News (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980), p. 141.

[43] Sudhaker, op. cit.

[44] Chaffee and Wilson, op. cit.

[45] Steven W. Keele, Attention and Human Performance (Pacific Palisades, Calis.: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1973), pp. 58-74.

[46] Nan Lin, The Study of Human Communication (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1973), pp. 23-44.

[47] Chaffee and Wilson, op. cit.

[48] John C. Merrill and Harold A. Fisher, The World's Greatest Dailies (New York: Hastings House, 1980).

[49] Hugh M. Culbertson, "The American Prestige Press: Did It Have a Vendetta Against Ferdinant Marcos in Early 1986?" paper presented to American Studies Program, De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines, June 1986.

[50]Seth Mydans, "Philippine Bishops Endorse Protests Against Vote Fraud," New York Times, Feb. 14, 1986, p. 5L; Mydans, "Marcos Says Report Casting Doubt on War Exploits is 'Foolishness'," New York Times, Jan. 24, 1986, p. A4; Mydans, "Marcos Criticizes 'Meddlers' in Vote," New York Times, Jan. 26, 1986, p. A6; "Marcos on the Americans," New York Times, Jan. 28, 1986, p. A18.

[51]David Howard Bain, "Letter from Manila: How the Press Helped to Dump a Despot," Columbia Journalism Review, May/June 1986, pp. 27-36.

[52]Keele, op. cit., p. 62.

[53]Under the null hypothesis, there were 6! or 720 possible equally likely rank-orderings of the six papers with respect to percentage of paragraph mentions addressing a given topic. Two sets of outcomes would have involved the two Filipino papers finishing last in the ranking (one set with Malaya ahead of the Philippine Daily Inquirer, and one set with the converse). Within each set, the four American papers could have been rank-ordered among themselves in 4! or 24 different ways. Thus the total number of equally likely outcomes under the null hypothesis with the two Filipino papers finishing last would be 2(24)=48. Furthermore, the probability of precisely seven topics of nine yielding this would be approximately ${}_9C_2(.067^7)=.000002$.

[54]Galtung and Ruge, loc. cit.

[55]Culbertson, "The American Prestige Press: Did It Have a Vendetta...?" op. cit.

[56]Alex S. Edelstein, "Communication and Culture: The Value of Comparative Studies," Journal of Communication, 33:302-10 (Summer 1983).